THEOLOGY

VOL. XLIX OCTOBER, 1946 No. 316

Editorial

MR MAURICE RECKITT'S *The Christian in Politics* (S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d.) might be described as a political grammar for English Christians. It is not a treatise on political theory nor a guide to policy, but an explanation of the principles that the Christian man must bear in mind as he proceeds to engage in political action. If the reader is tempted to complain that he is not shown enough how the principles enunciated can be applied to questions of the hour, the reply is ready (though Mr Reckitt does not say so): see the editorials in *Christendom*. For many years we have been grateful for the insight and courage and freshness of those editorials, and hope that they may long continue to come to our aid.

By comparison, *The Christian in Politics* is an austere and even laboured piece of writing: it contains hardly any of Mr Reckitt's inspired and illuminating epigrams. But we can see how much hard thought and careful discrimination lie behind the finished and fascinating work of the political commentator. Here too are warnings against the pitfalls that beset the Christian in politics—the fatal simplifications, the fashionable errors, and the pretexts for escape; but over all a relentless sense of responsibility, a hope unsoured by disappointment, a realism that never turns into cynicism. These are qualities of which we daily stand in greater need. Study or discussion groups would do well to work through this book,[1] chapter by chapter, looking for illustrations of its themes in the daily newspapers or in the current weeklies. The easiest chapter—easiest both to read and to act upon—is that on "Politics in Town and Parish." It is in local politics that indifference or inaction on the part of Christians is least excusable, for there at all events no one may plead complete incapacity to understand or lack of opportunity to do anything.

It is credibly reported that Christian students in our universities and colleges, unlike their predecessors a generation ago, are eager now to study the Bible and dogma, but display little, if any, interest in the discussion of political and social questions. This change may at first sight gratify the theologian, but it ought not to do so for long. There is something radically wrong with Bible study that induces pietism or absorption in religious interests. One way of counteracting this tendency is to press young men and women to study a book like Mr Reckitt's; another way is to show that the Bible itself is a manual of politics.

[1] It will be the second book to be sent to subscribers to the new S.P.C.K. "Double Aim" scheme. Subscribers to this scheme pay 5s. per annum and receive three books for study and at the same time will be helping to provide literature for Christians overseas.

The Relation of Confirmation to Baptism in the Early Roman and Byzantine Liturgies—II

We may now consider how we are to answer the question which is implied in the title of this paper. What is the relation between Baptism and Confirmation as they appear in the historic Roman and Byzantine liturgies? Is it purely a liturgical association? That is to say, does Confirmation succeed Baptism within the single framework of the ancient Orders, because, during the formative period of the liturgies, Christian initiates were for the most part adults, or at least had "come to the years of discretion," and consequently there was no reason (by the standards which now prevail among us) for deferring their Confirmation? Or, again, is there underlying the Orders some conception which involves in an essential unity the acts performed within their framework?

The student of Christian worship cannot fail to observe the operation of a new influence within the realm of Liturgy both during and after the fourth century. This new influence proceeds from a remarkable development in theological theory and popular devotion alike, and is particularly marked in regard to the Eucharist. Jerusalem played no small part in this development; and the *Catecheses* of Cyril offer us valuable information concerning what was, in effect, the transformation of the pre-Nicene eucharistic tradition. When, for instance, we compare the type of eucharistic liturgy presupposed by Cyril's *Catecheses* with that presupposed by Irenæus and Origen, or exhibited by Hippolytus, we notice that, by whatever steps they have progressed, Cyril and the Church of Jerusalem have reached an advanced position. It would, no doubt, be instructive to trace all the steps, if the evidence allowed us to do so; but, although it fails us in this respect, we may safely assert that, were it available in completeness, it would disclose the powerful effects of popular devotional interest, which, in the earlier centuries no less than in the later, fashioned the moulds into which official thought was poured. In the case of Baptism, on the other hand, we do not observe a development in any way comparable with that of the Eucharist. Perhaps because Baptism was of infrequent celebration at this early period, and perhaps also because, in the nature of things, Baptism could not offer the same congenial ground as the Eucharist for the play of new popular devotional ideas, the post-Nicene tradition of baptismal theory and practice is not essentially different from the pre-Nicene. We have already noticed the evidence for the general continuity of pattern. We are fortunate, however, in possessing other evidence providing fuller information, and of a date slightly earlier than Hippolytus's *Apostolic Tradition*. This is Tertullian's famous treatise *De Baptismo*,[1] written between A.D. 200 and 206.[2] Tertullian's treatise is of unique value in that it is both the only extant pre-Nicene

[1] For the Latin text see the edition by J. M. Lupton, Cambridge Patristic Texts, 1908; and for an English version see A. Souter, *Tertullian's Treatises concerning Prayer and concerning Baptism*, Translations of Christian Literature, Series II, S.P.C.K., 1919, pp. 46-72. Dr Souter's rendering is employed here.

[2] Following Souter and D'Alès; some scholars prefer an earlier date, *circa* A.D. 198.

treatment of a sacramental subject, and also an exact and ample exposition of the baptismal rite and its meaning.

Tertullian's baptismal rite can be outlined briefly. It consisted of the three acts which we have found to be the constituents of the Roman and Byzantine Orders. First, there was the immersion in water, or Baptism proper. Next, there was an anointing with blessed oil. Last, there was "Confirmation," administered, not with chrism, but with imposition of hands. The last is the climax and culmination of the rite, which is a single initiatory action.

Tertullian's exposition of this rite, and of the spiritual gifts associated with its constituent acts, is of the greatest importance and interest. To understand the essential character of the first, the baptismal, act, we must also understand the significance of the water in which the baptism is performed. Tertullian has much to say concerning the "liquid element" and its function in the divine ordering of the universe. "It is one of those elements which, before the world was created at all, rested with God in a form as yet rude"[1]; and, since we read in Genesis i that "the Spirit of God moved over the waters," we ought properly to think of water as "the home of the divine Spirit."[2] Further, so Tertullian's thought proceeds, water exercised a "regulative function"[3] in the work of creation; "the waters first were commanded to bring forth living beings,"[4] as we learn again from Genesis i. These considerations, together with the common use of water for purposes of cleansing, indicate the appropriateness of the element for Christian baptism, the purpose of which is to effect a cleansing and also to bring forth a new creature. The cleansing is, of course, a cleansing from sins, and the new creature is the regenerated Christian. If it be objected that the baptismal water is incapable of cleansing from sins, because these are rather a spiritual than a physical defilement, Tertullian is ready with an answer. The Spirit of God comes upon the water when God is invoked in the rite, he says, and "since every underlying substance catches the quality of that which is suspended over it, particularly when the former is corporeal and the latter is spiritual,"[5] the baptismal water is penetrated by the Spirit of God and acquires a quality of spiritual cleansing and of sanctifying. When he turns to regeneration, Tertullian is still thinking in terms of Genesis i. By virtue of his baptism, the baptized man, he states, "recovers the Spirit of God"[6] which the first man had received at his creation, but afterward had lost through transgression; and, in thus recovering the divine Spirit, the baptized man is restored, or recreated, in the divine image.

Tertullian's exposition is informed, no doubt, by his own ideas; it is certainly stamped with his own personal mode of expression. At the same time, he says so much that recalls the Roman "Blessing of the Font" that we may reasonably suppose his exposition to have been deliberately aligned with the themes which were already traditional in the baptismal prayers of his day, and which were considered so finally to express the significance of the baptismal act, that they were trans-

[1] Ch. 3. [2] *Ibid.* [3] *Ibid.*
[4] Ch. 3. [5] Ch. 4. [6] Ch 5: *recipit dei spiritum.*

mitted to the period of the liturgies without substantial change. Tertullian's agreement with the Roman and Byzantine baptismal liturgies about the effect of the baptismal act is both positive and negative. In this respect, his treatise is of peculiar value to us, in that it makes explicit much which the liturgies themselves assume as known, or leave implicit, and which for this reason became the subject of misunderstanding in later centuries.

We may sum up the view of Tertullian and the liturgies in respect of Baptism proper by saying that the baptismal act, in abolishing a man's sins, restores to him the innocence of the newly created Adam. But its operation is strictly confined to achieving this effect alone. To recover the Spirit of God is not identical with receiving the *Holy* Spirit. This distinction, implicit in the liturgies, is made explicit by Tertullian. On the other hand, both Tertullian and the liturgies make it clear that the *raison d'être* of the Christian initiatory rite is to bestow the Holy Spirit. Both Tertullian and the liturgies, again, make it clear that the gift of the Holy Spirit is bestowed in and through the final act of the initiatory rite. If the liturgies imply that Baptism is preparatory to what we know as Confirmation, Tertullian presents us with an explicit statement in this sense. "I do not mean to say," he writes, "that we obtain the Holy Spirit in the water, but having been cleansed in the water, we are being prepared . . . for the Holy Spirit."[1] It is with the laying-on of hands (unaccompanied, as we have observed, by unction in his rite) that Tertullian associates the bestowal of the Holy Spirit: "a hand is laid on us by way of blessing, summoning and inviting the Holy Spirit."[2] "Then that most Holy Spirit," he continues, "joyfully descends from the Father on cleansed and blessed bodies, and hovers over the waters of baptism, as if recognizing its ancient resting-place, gliding down upon the Lord in the form of a dove'."[3] In a word, the Christian initiatory rite confers that baptism of water and the Spirit without which (in the familiar Johannine phrase) a man "cannot enter the kingdom of God."

To have said so much is perhaps to have said enough in order to indicate that, in the early and patristic periods, the relation between Confirmation and Baptism is one of essential unity rather than of mere liturgical association. For completion in Christian initiation a man had to be "confirmed" as well as "baptized." Those who wish for a wider review of the evidence may refer again to Dr A. J. Mason's learned presentation and discussion of it. When an ancient writer spoke of "Baptism," the thought of "Confirmation" was as much present to his mind as that of Baptism proper. It should be remembered, indeed, that the very word *confirmatio* means "completion." It is a synonym of the word *perfectio*, which the author of the treatise *De Sacramentis* applies to that act in the rite "after the font . . . when, at the invocation of the priest, the Holy Spirit is bestowed."[4] Both are Latin equivalents of the Byzantine *teleiosis*. Without Confirmation, a man who had only

[1] Ch. 6.
[2] Ch. 8.
[3] *Ibid.*
[4] *De Sacr.*, ch. II.

been baptized was not, in the terminology of a later age, "a full Christian."[1]

We shall fall short of doing full justice both to the liturgies and Tertullian, however, if we do not penetrate farther into the background of their thought. It will have been observed that, although Tertullian makes no reference to anointing at Confirmation, his rite, like its Roman and Byzantine successors, inserts an anointing between baptism and the giving of the Holy Spirit. In speaking of this anointing, he uses the term which Latin was later to apply to the compound with which the anointing was performed—viz., *chrisma*, "chrism"[2]; and he is quick to draw attention to the connexion between this word and the name, or title, "Christ," "the Anointed," as the Roman "Consecration of the Chrism" was subsequently to do. The Greeks, unlike their Latin fellow-Christians, had no need for such elucidation; the relationship between the word "Christ" and the commonly used verb *chrio*, "I anoint," was obvious. The point may seem to be of small consequence. It is more than mere word-play, however; and if we neglect it we shall fail to notice an important element in the meaning which ancient Christians, Greek and Latin alike, found in their initiatory rite. That rite makes a man *Christianos*, *Christianus*, a "Christian"; and, as we have seen, Cyril of Jerusalem goes as far as to say to the new initiates, "You became christs, when you received the antitype of the Holy Spirit."[3] His next sentence is not less striking. "And all things have been done upon you," he proceeds, "in representational fashion, because you are representations of Christ."[4] Something of the same thought is in Tertullian's mind; for he speaks of the descent of the Spirit upon the newly baptized at their "Confirmation" in terms which are reminiscent of the accounts of the descent of the Spirit upon the Lord after He had come up from His baptism in the river Jordan. In other words, Confirmation, as conceived by these early teachers, is a representation of, or a sacramental parallel with, the Spirit's descent upon Christ after His baptism. In the same way, the Christian's baptism is a representation of, or a sacramental parallel with, the baptism of Christ Himself. The baptism of the Christ in water, therefore, and His anointing with the Holy Spirit upon His emergence from the water (a scene often depicted upon the walls or cupolas of the baptisteries),[5] were under-

[1] *Cf.* Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cat.* iii, 4, "Without both it is impossible for thee to be perfected . . . he who is being baptized with the water, but has not had the Spirit vouchsafed to him, has not the grace in perfection." From the case of Novatian we learn that, if in danger of death, a man could receive baptism alone; should he recover, it was necessary for him to be "sealed by the Bishop." Pope Cornelius objects against Novatian that he never was so sealed, and asks, "How could he have obtained the holy Spirit?"

[2] Ch. 7.

[3] See above, Part I, p. 264.

[4] Καὶ πάντα εἰκονικῶς ἐφ' ὑμῶν γεγένηται ἐπειδὴ εἰκόνες ἐστὲ Χριστοῦ.

[5] *E.g.*, in the two well-known baptisteries of the Catholics and the Arians at Ravenna; here the mosaics are of the fifth century, those in the Catholic baptistery having been "touched up" in the sixth. The earliest example of the baptism *motif* in fresco is that in the crypts of Lucina, the most ancient chambers in the cemetery of St Callisto at Rome; the date of this fresco is adjudged to be not later than A.D. 150. For another

stood to be both the origin and type of the Christian's initiation into Christianity; and, as the Gospel narratives link these two moments inextricably into a single event, so again in the baptismal liturgies of Rome and Constantinople, and in the rites out of which they developed, Baptism and Confirmation together constitute a single initiatory action.

We have one last point to consider. "All things have been done upon you," Cyril of Jerusalem writes, "in representational fashion." We shall misunderstand the attitude towards the initiatory rite assumed alike by Tertullian and Cyril and the ancient Christians of Rome and Constantinople, if we do not see that rite (and, with it, the other great sacramental rite of the Church, that of the Eucharist) as being essentially *dramatic*. Anglicans, at least old-fashioned Anglicans who do "not put their own sense and comment" upon the Book of Common Prayer, but "take it in the literal and grammatical sense," are accustomed to regard a sacramental rite as, at its core, an action performed in obedience to a command of Christ and carrying, in response to due obedience, the promise of spiritual benefit to such as are worthy to receive it. In the case of the Lord's Supper, and rather less in the case of Baptism, inherently necessary in the action is remembrance of the occasion upon which the Lord's instituting command was uttered. The sacramental services of the Prayer Book, therefore, require in the worshippers an exercise of historical recollection directed towards a once-for-all completed event in the remote past. The distinction between "then" and "now" is clear and marked. The mind of the ancient Christian worked differently. The distinction between present and past, in so far as it concerned the redemptive activities of the Lord's life, was not clear to the ancient Christian as it was to the medievally-educated Tudor Anglican and to those who came after him. The sacramental rites of the Church, as the ancient Christian regarded them, were drama; *repræsentaverunt*, they "made present again" to his sight, with all their saving potency, the divine acts from which those sacramental rites took their origin and their efficacy. The "then" was a part, indeed the principal part, of the "now." In the initiatory rite, the ancient Christian of Rome saw before him the primordial waters, and moving upon them the Spirit of God; he witnessed a reproduction, in miniature and in mystery, of the primal creative act; and he beheld the Holy Spirit descending upon the newly baptized, as upon Jesus Christ Himself, thus fulfilling the glorious purpose of man's creation. For the ancient Christian of Jerusalem and Constantinople, the sacrament, or "mystery," of initiation was a *mimesis*, a "representation," of the Baptism of the Lord, and so made present again the scene in Jordan. The candidate for initiation was taught to think of himself as participating in that action, as being associated "in representational fashion" with the Lord, and as having himself become, at the conclusion of the "mystery," a *Christos*, anointed with the unction of the Holy Spirit.

example, contemporary with Tertullian, *cf.* the fresco in the "chapel of the Sacraments," also in St Callisto. The continuity in *motif* between the earlier frescoes and later mosaics is striking.

There are certain differences in outlook between the Roman and Byzantine initiatory rites; but the agreements are more numerous, and are fundamental. Also, the views of Roman and Byzantine as to the dramatic character and the effect of the rites is identical. A Leonine Secret neatly expresses for us the theory of the effect of "representation": *Grant unto us, O Lord, to observe these mysteries; for as often as the act of commemorating the Victim well-pleasing to thee is performed, the work of our redemption is carried into effect.* The Secret refers, of course, to that Oblation which it is the purpose of the Mass to re-enact; but, *mutatis mutandis*, the principle which the Secret assumes is equally applicable to the liturgy of Baptism and Confirmation.

We have travelled far from Richard Hooker and from the Elizabethan Church of England and its formularies. The patterns of thought, under the influence of which the liturgies were fashioned, had been greatly modified before the sixteenth century; and in the West changes in the circumstances of Church life had produced corresponding changes in the practice and the theory of Baptism and Confirmation. Hooker's thought concerning the latter was inevitably affected by medieval interpretation and by that particular development of it which we observe in the writings of Cranmer, in the works of Jewel, and in the *Book of Common Prayer*. Taught by the Prayer Book, Hooker held Baptism proper to be the occasion of the bestowal of the Holy Spirit. This view could not but lead to a misunderstanding of the Fathers' expositions of Confirmation; and the Anglican Service of Confirmation provided no corrective. Had the Puritans been able to submit their questions to the Fathers, the answers would have been more definite than those which Hooker was able to give, and considerably more disturbing. If we are to assign a greater and less importance between the acts of the initiatory rite, while both are essential, the Fathers would say, Confirmation has a greater dignity in that it conveys the specifically Christian gift of the Holy Spirit, and therefore constitutes the true "christening" of the Christian; and, in conclusion, the Fathers would have pointed to the Roman and Byzantine baptismal liturgies as embodying the common mind of Scripture and tradition upon the matter.

E. C. Ratcliff.

(*Concluded.*)

Towards a Theology of Providence

The purpose of this article is to raise the question of the theology of Providence, in its broadest sense. It is a subject which seems to come into modern theological discussion chiefly in the form of God's providential ordering of history; but the traditional doctrine is a wider one than this, and seems to deserve re-thinking.

In his admirable article of which the first part was published in

May, Prof. Dodd sums up an idea that will be familiar to most readers of THEOLOGY when he says: "The Bible, in both Testaments, is concerned with a supernatural revelation communicated in history. The history consists of a series of providentially directed events, with the interpretation of these events by men of inspired insight; event and interpretation interlocking inseparably." If we take the biblical revelation as our starting-point, it seems that there are four ways in which God intervenes in the world so as—without taking away man's free will—to direct the course of history providentially, using the term "providentially" here in a wide sense.

The first occurs when God speaks to man's spirit and calls man to co-operate consciously and willingly in His purpose. Such was the call of Abraham; and by Abraham's obedience—but by God's call and initiative—a new nation was ultimately created to be a most important instrument of God's purpose in history. Time would fail, as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews says, to tell of all those who have "believed God" and been the agents of His purpose in this way, both under the Old Covenant and under the New.

Secondly, it is part of the biblical revelation that God may, for His special purpose, at special times, do acts which appear to man, at least, as suspensions of the normal behaviour of physical objects, and direct interventions of God in nature, other than through the powers He has given to man—in fact, miracles. Thus Moses and Aaron were inspired to lead the Israelites out of Egypt, but the Lord also sent the pillar of cloud by day and the pillar of fire by night; He rolled back the waters of the sea and brought them together again to overwhelm Pharaoh's host; and by such "signs and wonders" (Deut. xxvi, 8), no less than by the leading of Moses and Joshua, he delivered Israel and made them a people. Whatever the Christian philosopher and biblical critic may think of any particular Old Testament miracle, or even of some New Testament miracles, there remains one such intervention of God in history which is cardinal to the Christian faith and which is summed up (to quote Prof. Dodd again) "in the New Testament *kerygma*" which "sets forth what God has done through the coming of Christ, His life, work, death, and resurrection." This, like the example just referred to from the Old Testament, is an intervention of God in power for the redemption and deliverance of His faithful, and we may logically class with this, as its consequence and extension, the acts of God the Holy Spirit in history through the Church, whenever it acts in accordance with the divine will.[1] There are, of course, miracles which are not directly redemptive, but are revelatory, in the sense that the Burning Bush was not to give Moses light or heat but to reveal the presence of the Lord, and the Miraculous Draught of Fishes (John xxi) was not to give the disciples food but to reveal the presence of the Christ; and all miracles are, to those who have eyes to see, acts of revelation also.

The third type of divine intervention in history, which is clearly described in the Old Testament, and perhaps less explicitly, but never-

[1] See Charles Williams, *The Descent of the Dove*, passim.

theless by implication, in the New, occurs when God uses the actions of men as the means to accomplish some purpose of His, but without their conscious co-operation. Thus it was that the Assyrian aggressor became to Israel, according to the Lord's declaration through the prophet, "the rod of mine anger," though the gentile ruler had no intention of serving the God of Israel; and thus also Cyrus, in the course of a similar career of conquest, became the "anointed" of the Lord, because he was the instrument of the Lord's providence. Though not explicit in the New Testament, it is an ancient Christian view that the pacification and unification of the Mediterranean world by Augustus were a divinely ordered preparation for the spread of the Gospel[1]; and this view finds support in St Paul when he teaches that the secular authorities, from the emperor downwards, "are ordained of God," and that the heathen magistrate is a "minister of God" for the punishment of evildoers (Rom. xiii, 1, 4; *cf.* 1 Pet. ii, 13*ff.*).

But the Christian doctrine of providence, inherited from Judaism and shared (in so far as ideas of Allah correspond to the truth about Almighty God) by Islam, does not limit providence to the "large-scale" events of history or the general workings of a providentially appointed world order. There is a sentence in Prestige's *God in Patristic Thought* which vividly illustrates the type of event in which the divine providence was seen by the early Church: in discussing what the Fathers called *oikonomia* Prestige quotes from the Acts of certain martyrs, "Lo, by divine providence (οἰκονομίᾳ) they met a donkey-driver."[2] The early Church, and the tradition of Christian piety ever since, have undoubtedly seen the hand of God—*i.e.*, His providential ordering of human affairs—not only in miracles and in the great developments of history, but in events that are significant in the life of the individual, events like meeting a certain person at a certain time, which would seem, humanly speaking, to be matters of chance. Just as heathen rulers were unconscious agents of the divine purpose in history, so one person (in this case a donkey-driver), while going about his business with quite other motives, may, in this traditional view, be unconsciously fulfilling God's purpose that a certain meeting should take place.

There would seem also to be a fourth way, closely similar to this, by which God influences the course of events in this world, and that is the exercise of His providence in controlling apparently chance events in the physical world, where no human will is concerned. It may be advisable, for theological purposes, to distinguish this both from miracle (where there is at least an apparent suspension of some "law of nature") and from the type of providence just mentioned, where voluntary human actions are concerned. For example, the coming of rain at a certain time may be of very great significance to a community or to an individual: the changes of the weather cannot be completely predicted by science, and no miracle is involved in rain falling at that time; on the other hand, no miracle would have been involved if it had not fallen. If divine providence is seen in such happenings, as it undoubtedly is by Christian tradition, this argues a direct control of God

[1] Eusebius, *Dem. Evang.* iii. 7, 140. [2] *Op. cit.*, p. 65 (*cf.* the whole chapter).

over nature, short of "miracle" yet not depending on any influence, even a hidden one, over human minds and wills.

That God does exercise providence not only in great events which are part of history, but in individual lives, is surely part of the Christian tradition. The two spheres are not distinct, because what we call "history" means those events in certain human lives which have been most significant for large numbers of other people at the time or later. But there are other events which, though they are all-important for one or a few persons, and through them for some others, are not the concern of history. A battle is won or lost, but at the same time individual persons are killed, on both sides, and families are bereaved, but history cannot chronicle the names of all the fallen. An anti-Christian movement sweeps a country; history records the result for the nation and the Church, but not the exact form of the choice before each person and the result for him. The Christian message certainly is that God *knows* and is concerned with all His children's concerns in all the detail in which they appear to them. "All the hairs of your head are numbered," for "Ye are of more value than many sparrows." It also seems to be the Christian doctrine that, in many of the uncertainties of life which are normally or apparently matters of chance, God may and does on occasions exercise His providence to influence the lives of individual persons; and (since it is God who acts) to influence them for good.

It would be easy to quote texts stressing a simple and sincere view of God's providence which speak very strongly to Christian devotion: "A thousand shall fall beside thee and ten thousand at thy right hand, but it shall not come nigh thee." "I waited patiently for the Lord, and He inclined unto me and heard my calling. He brought me also out of the horrible pit, out of the mire and clay; and set my feet upon the rock, and ordered my goings." "This is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes." But the theologian must be careful not to go astray; the book of Job alone should remind us that material misfortune as well as good fortune must be taken into account; there is misfortune which God does not will, though He permits it, even though it may lead a good man almost to deny the goodness of God. Even in relation to the "changes and chances of this mortal life" we may say with another psalm, "the days of man are but as grass." Especially we remember as Christians that when it is a case of divine goodness in human life facing man's power to do harm by sin, to rely on God's providence to prevent suffering may be wrong: "He shall give His angels charge concerning thee . . . that thou hurt not thy foot against a stone" (from the same psalm [xci] as the first quotation above) is answered by "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." God will not take away the free will of sinners, even though the righteous must suffer by it. The ultimate vindication of the righteous and exercise of God's mercy and providence may be reached only, as we might say in a modern terminology, "outside history": in other words, in the Kingdom of God, whether that is a present reality which its members enjoy by faith, or whether it is something to be entered only after this life.

Christians are commanded to "Seek first the kingdom of God";

nevertheless the average Christian, still more the average man in a semi-Christian country, to whom the Gospel must be preached, is not called to give up all concern with where his next meal is coming from—or rather, as it more often happens, with such things as getting into a steady post-war job in which he can both earn a living and ask God's blessing on his work, getting a house in which he and his wife can bring up children adequately, seeing his country prosperous and at peace for the rest of his life, and some security for his children. These blessings, which he looked for just as much as the modern man, the godly Israelite expected to obtain from the providence of the Lord:

> For thou shalt eat the labours of thine hands: O well is thee and happy shalt thou be.
> Thy wife shall be as the fruitful vine: upon the walls of thine house.
> Thy children like olive branches: round about thy table.
> Lo, thus shall the man be blessed: that feareth the Lord.
> The Lord from out of Sion shall so bless thee: that thou shalt see Jerusalem in prosperity all thy life long.
> Yea, thou shalt see thy children's children: and peace upon Israel.
> (Ps. cxxviii, 2-7.)

The modern man, like the men of the discontented Hellenistic world in which Christianity was first preached, wants these things, and after a period of world war he wants them very badly. The man of the first century was inclined to feel that the obtaining such things was a matter of blind chance, and to deify *Tyche*; or he saw them, not unreasonably, as the gift of a powerful ruler, a Hellenistic king or the Roman emperor, and (with official encouragement) deified the ruler. In the modern world, in spite of the enormous extension of the power of science for good—the substitution, one might say, of the hospital and penicillin for the temple of Æsculapius—the things which man so much wants in this world seem to be as much as ever at the mercy of forces beyond his control. He can make efforts of his own by industry and temperance, by accepting rationing, utility goods, and high taxes, and he can still in democratic countries plan for the future and combine with those who think like him to persuade others to agree to what he thinks should be done; but after all his planning and striving the result seems to rest either with natural forces like disease or world shortage, or, more often, with the decisions of those whom he cannot persuade and is powerless to influence in any way.

In these circumstances it is worth considering what place the doctrine of providence should have in the Christian message. Certainly, of course, it must not detract in any way from the central message of the Gospel which deals not only with this life but with the Kingdom of Heaven, with sin and with redemption, repentance and grace, and eternal life. Nor should the providence of God be taken to mean that there is no room for human planning—*i.e.*, prudence or human providence—or that the Christian must accept whatever happens as the will of God in a spirit of quietism. Science would seem to say that all events are the result of physical or biological causes or of human volition, and scientific humanism says that human volition must and

can be so controlled and co-ordinated by human reason—*i.e.*, by planning—and man's control over nature so used and extended, that human life shall be made happy and secure: atomic war and starvation prevented, standards of living raised, and so on. Christianity says that human reason and especially human volition unaided cannot produce this result, and, without the grace of God, it is so subject to human jealousies and divisions that it will produce only a tower of babel: men must therefore consciously seek to hear God's voice and to co-operate with His purpose, which they can do only by His grace in Christ. Should Christianity also say, and how far should it emphasize, that besides human volition (even aided and guided by grace) there is another cause at work in the world, God's providence, which operates either through human volition, but without men's conscious co-operation, or through apparently chance events in the physical world, and that this operates, not only in great events, but in small? Should the Church tell men that the advertisement seen by chance that leads to a satisfying and worth-while job, the chance meeting that leads to a happy marriage, the apparent luck in obtaining a house or a flat, may not be quite so fortuitous as they appear, but may be the working of God's providential care, for which men owe Him thanks? If so, the Church will be teaching a traditionally Christian doctrine, and talking about things which very much interest the ordinary man: and it may lead those who cannot at present appreciate God's goodness in creation and redemption to appreciate it at least in providence, and to progress from not thinking about Him at all to thankfulness for material blessings, and thence to the desire to serve God by a better life, and so to repentance and prayer for grace, and the appreciation of the Church and sacraments. On the other hand, if the Church preaches this, she is in danger of preaching a this-worldly religion, and depicting a God who is chiefly concerned with the material prosperity of a particular nation or group, whose care for His world is shown in such things as the victory of the Allies in the war rather than in the Incarnation, Passion, and Resurrection of Christ, who may be thanked for the prosperity of His worshippers' businesses or the high level of their wages irrespective of their moral qualities in their working life. Also, the Church will have to meet the bad-luck story and the criticism of the discontented, who say that, if this is the providence of God, He dispenses His favours most unfairly in letting them suffer: the attitude of those who say, "I can't believe in God since my son was killed in the war"; and the more stress is laid on God's providence in granting material blessings, the harder it will be to meet these types of disbelief without the appearance of insincerity. It will be unsatisfactory to say that God's providence is inscrutable, and that, though some may be blessed with more of this world's goods than others, we must all do our duty in that station in life to which we are called—which is a position to which the Church has been driven in the past by the traditional doctrine of providence badly understood and badly taught.

It is probably for this last reason that the doctrine of providence has so largely disappeared from Christian preaching. It probably appears in Christian teaching now mostly in two forms: in teaching about

God's providence in the form of His gifts in nature to mankind as a whole—*i.e.*, food, light, air, the beauties of the world considered as the common possession of all; and in the teaching of devotion and spiritual direction, oral and written, in which those who are, or should be, already practising Christians are taught to look for the fulfilment of their prayers (including prayers for material blessings) by God's providence, and to thank Him for gifts received in such a way, and even to see His providence in the unexpected events of life and to accept it thankfully. But there does not seem to be (except in the unsatisfactory form mentioned above) any thought-out theology of the part played by providence in individual lives, in the Church of England, nor probably elsewhere outside the Roman Catholic Church, which, no doubt, has a systematized doctrine, however open to objections it may be. I have not looked up the literature: the Roman doctrine almost certainly deserves attention by non-Romans, and there is probably much that theologians of other communions could profitably say on the basis of scripture (especially the New Testament) and tradition, which has not been said here. This article is merely to suggest that more attention might be given to the doctrine in theological discussion and informed and reasoned preaching.

G. N. S. Hunt.

Von Hügel and His Message for To-day

It is twenty-five years since the death of Baron Friedrich von Hügel, and the subsequent second world-war has but added to his influence and clarified his substantive contributions to the religious life and thought of our day. Can these be in some measure assessed within the space of a comparatively short essay? Not easily, for the Baron's writings are lengthy, sometimes involved, and never easy. Yet certain things stand out clearly.

(i) First I would cite his humbling but courageous confession that, although religion is the central interest in man's life, it is not his only interest. Souls may be intoxicated from other sources than by God. Man's thirst for God is not his only thirst, and even though his soul may be restless until it rests in Him, man does find at any rate temporary resting-places *en route*. This very fact of the centrality but not the totality of man's interest in religion adds really to the final significance of religion. What else doth profit a man?

(ii) No word is perhaps more characteristic of von Hügel than that God is "Given". For him, the Givenness of God is the unimpeachable first datum of experience. The analysis of experience may perhaps lead to blunders in the interpretation, but it cannot do away with the primary fact that God is "Given," neither inferred nor subjectively projected or conceived. We cannot here exhaustively analyse what exactly is meant by the Given in the Baron's philosophy, but nothing is more impressive in his writings than his unswerving maintenance

of this primary datum. Because of this, and arising both from his intellectual honesty and his rare humility, he is never weary of affirming that our intellectual processes are altogether inadequate to account for all the data either of the whole range of human experience or of specifically religious experience. Hence his constant teaching that more is to be learnt from our dim apprehensions of the Reality we call God than from a fully developed dialectic or theology. Here he shares with Leibniz an appreciation of what the latter calls "petites perceptions." It is this delicacy of discrimination which imparts both balance and beauty to his spiritual analyses, whether of some often overlooked details of the Gospels or in the lives of the lesser known souls of saintly sort.

(iii) Most original and most far-reaching of all his analyses, however, is that contained in the second chapter of *The Mystical Element of Religion.* There he expounds and illustrates his justly celebrated thesis that there are three fundamental elements in religion. These are the institutional, the credal-critical, the mystical-operative. They are invariable, basic, inexpugnable essentials of religion. His word "element" is perhaps better replaced by "constituent"; his analysis possibly does not allow adequately for either the æsthetic or the numinous in religion, but taken in its grand sweep and simplicity it stands as the most original contribution of our day to the understanding of religion. Von Hügel can write trenchantly, but he will not attempt to compress the awful realities of religion into an epigram such as Whitehead's. No; for him the greatness and the grandeur of religion in human experience require a consideration and a scrutiny commensurate therewith. In his exposition he underlines the sacramental implications of his argument, and these are more fully drawn out in his subsequent essays and addresses.

(iv) Allied to this scheme is his less appreciated doctrine of friction and tension. In the healthy spiritual life, both of the individual and of society, these three constituents are never static, never at a deadening level of activity: no; now one, now another is for a while paramount, though the others are never reduced to impotence. But the history of religion is a history of frictions and tensions as is any spiritual biography. Were it not so, religion would invalidate itself by its deadening dulness. And because it *is* so, we can afford to be undismayed where doctrinal disputes are concerned, need not be put off our stroke, as it were, because not all souls are equally obedient, not all equally intellectual, not all equally sensitive to the sacramental and the mystical. It is this recognition that kept von Hügel steady amid the painful but passing troubles of Modernism. Moreover, because of these frictions and tensions not only do spiritual geniuses thrive and grow, but we can afford to be wisely charitable toward those great movements in the history of religion which bear such misleading labels as "reformation," "schisms," "heresies," and the like. No label is ever adequate wholly to express the full truth concerning what is labelled. This does not mean that the Baron ever wavered in his conviction that Catholic Christianity was the richest, fullest, most satisfying and most enduring presentation and practice of the life and teachings of our Lord. *Securus*

judicat orbis terrarum. But also it does not mean that he would deny value or underestimate the lesser values enshrined in other modes of Christian expression.

(v) Nowhere is von Hügel's teaching more permanent and yet more timely in the aftermath of war than in his superb essay on *Suffering and God.* The perpetual recrudescence of the patripassian heresy gives added worth to his searching yet large-minded criticism thereof and to his final and decisive affirmation that the Chalcedonian formula best meets human needs in dealing with this admittedly difficult problem. The note of joy which is ever in his mind when reflecting upon the Divine characteristics is especially uppermost in this essay. "Who for the sake of the Joy before Him endured the Cross." Von Hügel realizes to the full the hunger of suffering man for comfort and companionship in his distress and he shows how the doctrine of the Eternal in whom Pure Joy is resident whilst in the Incarnate Son real suffering is experienced and overcome enables sympathy and shared suffering to be alike at the soul's service. The sufferings of Good Friday were the prelude, the necessary prelude, but only the prelude to the Joy and the Triumph of Easter Day. No one who heard, as the writer heard, the Baron's deep vibrant voice as he closed this magnificent effort by recounting his own experience on Good Friday, 1899, in Rome, can ever forget the profound emotions stirred by his final words. It is in this essay that von Hügel shows himself to be not only the "thinker's thinker, and the writer's writer" (his own words), but also a very sure guide for the soul in her deepest agonies. The Abbé Huvelin, whose one interview was so decisive for him, and who fashioned the life of Charles de Foucauld, would have been justly proud of Friedrich von Hügel's fulfilment of the vocation he had discerned in him.

(vi) Vocation. It is generally deemed to be rather the office of the priest than of the layman to impart instruction on the nature, meaning and the obligations of vocation. But only von Hügel has added a new significance to our understanding of it in his remarkable insistence upon the twin vocations of celibacy and marriage. For men and women generally marriage is the natural normal vocation, and Christianity has once and for all set its seal upon the natural vocation and made it sacramental and supernatural. Yet sacramental, dedicated, consecrated marriage requires, he shows, the support of that twin vocation, to which only the relatively few are called but imperiously called, the vocation of dedicated, consecrated, sacramental, supernatural celibacy. Peter needs his John, Timothy his Paul. How sound is the instinct, in a fully Christian marriage, to dedicate a son or a daughter to the way, the consecrated way of celibacy, and other sons and daughters to the equally consecrated way of consecrated marriage. Bernard Holland, the editor of the Baron's *Letters*, gave one daughter in marriage, and seven days later another to the convent. Similarly one of von Hügel's daughters espoused the enclosed life, and another the vowed life of Christian marriage. Fine as all the Baron's sympathies were, they were never so beautifully fine as in his sensitive appreciation of these twin vocations, and his charity towards those priests within his own knowledge who had forsaken their primary

vows for those of marriage was as sincere as it was penetrating. Contrast his spiritual reading of what vocation means with the excellent but excellently secular analysis of vocation in Rashdall's *Theory of Good and Evil*. It is in line with his equally noble vindication of heroic virtue which, combined with joy and the abiding efficacious sense of the supernatural, is the ultimate differentia of Christian sanctity.

(vii) The Baron was not merely a lay theologian, a lay philosopher, he was a geologist and an entomologist. This not only humanized his philosophy and theology, but enabled him to maintain his serenity and stability amid the seeming shocks of scientific scepticism. Indeed, he regards science as the fine medicinal discipline and purgatory of theology. He will recognize divine signatures therein, just as he will recognize the common notes of sanctity in a charwoman, an Angelic Doctor, a Father Damien and a Curé d'Ars. What is the scientist doing but reporting upon the manifold wonders of God in Nature, as do the artist and philosopher and theologian upon those wonders in Man and in History?

And of those wonders the greatest is personality. It may be that von Hügel never posed or faced the direct issue: "What does it mean to be a person?" Here he is no different from all that great company of contemporary philosophers who have written upon the subject of personality, but never upon persons; persons-in-the-making. Nevertheless, he has seized, as others have seized, upon personality, the sacredness of personality, as the most pressing issue for politics, philosophy, and theology. His friend Clement Webb and his admirer William Temple had not yet delivered their Gifford Lectures upon this subject, but their indebtedness to him, like that of A. E. Taylor and Norman Kemp Smith, has always been gratefully, greatly, and generously acknowledged by them.

Doubtless because of his profound sense of the abiding value of personality, his influence was so far-reaching and decisive upon the student world of his day, upon academic circles within and without his own church and upon individuals like Gwendolen Greene, George Tyrrell, Maude Petre, Evelyn Underhill; upon others; and upon the entire personnel of the London Society for the Study of Religion. That that society yet survives and thrives, preserves its peculiar ethos, is due to Friedrich von Hügel and Claude Montefiore, those two great servants of God.

ALBERT A. COCK.

Poetry in the Theatre

The Assassin, by Peter Yates. Chatto and Windus, 1945. 6s.
For the Time Being, by W. H. Auden. Faber, 1945. 8s. 6d.
This Way to the Tomb!, by Ronald Duncan. Faber. 6s.
The House of the Octopus, by Charles Williams. Edinburgh House Press, 1945. 5s.
The Old Man of the Mountains, by Norman Nicholson. Faber. 6s.
The Shadow Factory, by Anne Ridler. Faber. 6s.

In England in the last twelve years poetic drama has become once again a living art. Some of our best poetry has been dramatic and our best plays poetic. This development may interest the readers of Theology for various reasons. It is not unimportant that the best poetic plays are theological, and that some whose substance is farther away from any orthodox theology owe as much formally to the language of the liturgy. Such developments do help to restore familiarity with theological conceptions and liturgical rhythms. But theologians and priests will understand them best if they consider them not simply as unexpected aids in their own work, but as they are in themselves, inevitable responses to the situation of poetry and drama in the contemporary world.

The verse play is part of a general movement away from naturalistic representation of the surface appearances of things towards a much more abstract and formal analysis of their structure and order. Twenty years ago this movement was esoteric, "modern," and highbrow. To-day it is still challenged by elderly academicians in letters to *The Times*; but broadly speaking it is accepted, and its effects are seen in the advertisement poster, the literature of the bookstalls, the theatre, the cinema, and the novel. Two interesting manifestations are the popular passion for ballet, a very formal and abstract kind of rhythmical entertainment, and the progress of Walt Disney from the comic strip to the full-size film. I do not suggest that *Fantasia* even attempts to be a formally unified work of art. I do believe that the audiences who enjoyed *Fantasia* would be prepared to accept an equally formal work directed to a serious purpose of "purging the soul by pity and terror." And if the cinemagoers are ready, the much more select audience who take the trouble to go to the theatre are more alert and better prepared. The problem now is, not to induce them to accept poetry, symbolism, a formal representation, but to find enough good poetry to give them.

The purely naturalistic play and the naturalistic approach to the classics of the theatre are dead. Only twenty years ago Shakespeare was read like a novel; *Hamlet* was disguised as Ibsen, in modern dress. Nowadays the film of *Henry V* calls attention to the sense in which the Elizabethan play was a game, a charade in which actors and audience joined, a dance to embody patriotism, politics, love, and religion. We too would join the dance. We would have a drama in which we participate, for we are tired of watching the shadows on the screen.

Who can give us such a drama, and how? It is at this point that the advantages of the Christian poet over his non-Christian *confrère* begin to tell. If the drama needs poetry, poetry needs the theatre in order to re-establish contact between the poet and his lost audience. At the present time a volume of poetry has infinitesimally small sales in comparison with a novel, or a book of short stories of inferior quality. Poets must write novels and criticism to bring their poetry to the attention even of the discriminating public. For the art of reading poetry has not yet recovered, as the art of looking at pictures and listening to music is slowly recovering, from the materialistic doldrums of the last sixty years. To those who learnt to like Mr Henry Moore's work through his paintings of shelter scenes in the War Artists'

Exhibition at the National Gallery, line and colour conveyed a whole complex of thought and emotion, of which little was lost in the excellent reproductions provided by the thought and enterprise of the editors of the "King Penguin" series.[1] The reader of poetry does not normally hear it, unless he stays up to listen to a poetry reading from the B.B.C., generally at the very end of their program. It is easier to read a non-naturalistic novel by Kafka or Rex Warner, where the rhythms are those of naturalistic prose conversation, than it is to read the *Four Quartets* or the poems of Miss Kathleen Raine without some education in imagery and rhythm. There the theatre can help. *Murder in the Cathedral* and *This Way to the Tomb!* both owe a great part of their popular success to the enthusiasm of Mr Martin Browne and the elocution of Mr Speaight. Many people must have learnt from him for the first time how this modern poetry goes. He has done as much and more for poetry as Mr Eric Newton has done for painting.

But this kind of work depends on a belief that barriers between the artist and the public can be broken, that there is no unbridgeable chasm between the poet's own experience and the need of the ordinary man and woman. The experience itself is not simply the frustration of a supersensitive mind by the cruelty and irony of the external world, as some æsthetes would like to believe. Rather it is one facet in the common plight of man in all ages, confronted with his own limitations and with the very nature of things. Public art is impossible without a desire for a common and public philosophy, Christian, Buddhist, or Communist. A personal dilemma, however poignant, will not make a play for actors and an audience.

Poems, short stories, and even novels can be made out of an experience that remains in its inner core individual and incommunicable, like the poetry of William Blake, *Wuthering Heights*, or the later novels of Mrs Woolf. But the plays of W. B. Yeats, in so far as they come to life in the theatre, depend for their success on their author's passionate interest in the re-creation of some kind of community of thought and feeling in his audience. Yeats was not a Christian, but in his *Resurrection* he came very much nearer than most Christian writers to grasping the full significance of the Incarnation as a dramatic means to the unification of complex and conflicting experiences. It is not the only possible dramatic means. But those who essay to use it as such have a much greater variety of experience behind them, a wider choice of method, than can possibly be available to the poet who searches for an alternative, in the primitive, in the oriental, or in the new red world of Moscow. The feelings to be engendered by these symbols have to be more or less artificially imposed. The best political drama I know in modern verse, *The Assassin*, by Peter Yates, plays upon the deep-seated and persistent conflict between the values of North and South in modern America. Most Communist plays so far have either failed to be plays or missed being Communist.

Auden's interesting efforts in that direction all slid back significantly into Christian idioms at crucial points. In his last dramatic work he

[1] In *Henry Moore*, with an introduction by Geoffrey Grigson (Lane), 2s. 6d.

simply gives in. *For the Time Being* is not, I think, theological drama on the level of Mr Eliot, Mr Charles Williams, or Mr Nicholson, though it contains passages of verse which equal or surpass anything that they have written, as for instance the Virgin's song:

> O shut your bright eyes that mine must endanger
> With their watchfulness: protected by its shade
> Escape from my care: what can you discover
> From my tender look but how to be afraid?
> Love can but confirm the more it would deny.
> Close your bright eye.

And again the Wise Men:

> The singular is not Love's enemy;
> Love's possibilities of realization
> Require an Otherness that can say I.
>
> Not In but With our time Love's energy
> Exhibits Love's immediate operation;
> The choice to love is open till we die.

In point of construction, despite some very obvious botching where the style of an oratorio cannot be sustained, and recourse is had to a meditative or rhetorical prose, it is a good deal less untidy than *On the Frontier* or *The Ascent of F6*.

This Way to the Tomb! has been strikingly successful on the London stage. Priests who want to know what serious-minded young people in London like seeing again and again must get it out of the library if they can. They will enjoy the wit and the felicity of the descriptive poetry, even though the substance may seem less original and exciting than the verse in which it is clothed. In truth this play seems to me to derive very directly from *Murder in the Cathedral*, and from Auden and Isherwood in music-hall mood. What gives it distinction is the extraordinary sensuous craftsmanship of the verse, linking sight, smell, and sound in music, and the passionate sincerity of Mr Duncan's sympathy with frustration, on the high level of spiritual exaltation, and on the much lower levels satirized in the Anti-Masque. He does believe that the plight of man is one and same in the fifth century and in the twentieth, in India and in England. That suffices to redeem his negativism and to give point to positive moments, rare and significant, missed perhaps by two-thirds of the audience, but fundamental to his purpose:

> Dear Christ, who stands above and beyond me, restore
> My sight before
> I die, that I may see your sweet humility
> And know you love me.
> Dear Christ, I sink in my own misery,
> For pity's sake lift me into your Mercy, Mercy!

And again in the second part:

> Chorus. Only a Son can
> Lift a Mother's sorrow.

2ND WOMAN. Where is my son?
1ST WOMAN. I am a young woman
growing old in grief.
Is there no hope,
no one to help?
CHORUS. Only one man can.

The other three plays are explicitly Christian. *The House of the Octopus* was performed under the auspices of the International Missionary Council. Of this it seems necessary to say that it is not really up to the standard of the author's *Cranmer of Canterbury*. It is more of a play and less of a pageant, but in striving to simplify his verse for communication Mr Williams lost something that was part of the pith and marrow of his idiom. It comes again in moments, when the Flame, who is the Holy Ghost, speaks and sings. But some of the verse in the *Octopus* sinks to the pedestrian, an adjective which no one would ever apply to *Cranmer* or to any part of *Taliessin through Logres*. In poetry, speaking generally, the greatest concentration of meaning in fewest words is the highest virtue. In drama this must be modified if a speech is not to contain too many ideas. There is a limit to the intensity of concentration that the audience can receive in a given time, before the next speech comes to cut and thrust across the train of thinking. "The most poetic is the most dramatic" was a useful sword to slay some false antitheses, but it is not a principle of universal application.

Mr Nicholson's *The Old Man of the Mountains* may err through an excess of meaning. It seems to me more likely that the methods used to modify this danger failed to commend themselves upon the London stage. The book in the study has been more favourably received than the play in the theatre. There the apparent simplicity of most of Mr Nicholson's characters concealed from the dramatic critics the extraordinary skill with which their homely comments on the action were selected, framed, and driven home. This is not a dialect play or a simple story from the Scriptures, but an interpretation of prophecy, of the Word of God in the world "like a sharp two-edged sword," setting all in doubt even in the heart of the prophet. Elijah in Cumberland struck some critics as a minor instead of a major figure, because Carmel could not be spectacular up on our own quiet lakeland fells. The conflict of Jehovah and Baal seemed to shrink into a dispute over methods of farming. This criticism illustrates the persistence among us of the romantic passion for poetry as a means to heighten emotion, to carry us away in stupefaction to some vaster world of huge and indefinite boundaries. To Mr Nicholson's Elijah the Holy Ghost speaks in the still small voice of birds in the bushes, the beck at the bottom of the garden. If he is a modern, a northerner, and a local preacher, rather than a dervish in Samaria in the ninth century B.C., he need not be too narrowly located in Cumberland, for his philosophy is the one that to-day is sweeping the western half of the European continent. What matters in it is not the choice between soft fruit and arable, afforestation and hydraulic engineering, but the necessity of an "existential" decision if we are to have any philosophy at all.

The Shadow Factory is a serious attempt to solve the problem of a play that shall advance from the discussion of social questions through art and culture to ultimate issues without a dramatic hiatus. The climax is a tableau of the Nativity in the form of a play within a play. The verse descends directly from Mr Eliot's *The Family Reunion*. Unfortunately the transitions from verse to prose are less successful than in *The Old Man*. In the Nativity play Mrs Ridler uses a good deal of her own kind of verse, excellent for reflections on metaphysical problems through physical symbols, but not altogether in place in a play, even in a Christmas play. But we look for more from Mrs Ridler, whose insight into character is as shrewd as Mr Nicholson's. Her factory hands are as admirably drawn as his country folk. A poetry that can interpret the fundamental human dilemma in terms of the experience of housewives, agricultural labourers, farmers, and factory hands will lead to a revival of more than poetic drama.

GEORGE EVERY, S.S.M.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. E. C. Ratcliff is Professor of Liturgical Theology in the University of London.

Mr G. N. S. Hunt is on the staff of the Oxford University Press.

The Rev. Prof. A. A. Cock was formerly Principal of St John's College, York.

Brother George Every is a member of the Society of the Sacred Mission at Kelham.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE CHURCH IN ENGLAND AND IN INDIA

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

It is with great reluctance that I write this letter because I do not think that correspondence such as has appeared in THEOLOGY about South India really achieves much. It seems to me rather to exacerbate than to soften a controversy over a matter of profound theological importance and one which is on all sides admitted to be likely to affect profoundly the whole question of Christian reunion. I should not seek to add to the correspondence were it not that I have been urged to do so by those whose judgment I greatly respect, and in doing so I have no desire to try to justify the actions or utterances of any religious community. I am content to believe that what they have done or said with regard to the South India Scheme has been done and said only after careful consideration and prayer and because they felt that they could not conscientiously do otherwise. This, I believe, to be true of those who have taken up a different attitude. It would be

impossible to deny that some wild statements have been made by both sides "in the heat of controversy"; the present danger of the correspondence in THEOLOGY would appear to make it likely that more such statements will be made. I would like to suggest that the following things should be remembered:

1. The sincerity of both the advocates and opponents of the Scheme should be accepted.

2. That what is under discussion and examination is a document, the theological statements of which ought to be carefully and thoroughly criticized because the document is in effect the formulary and the charter of a new province of the Church. Its importance is further enhanced because it is cited as the pattern for schemes of reunion elsewhere. The motives of those who drew it up as well as their orthodoxy or lack of it are of secondary importance. The framers will pass away, the document remains. And now is the time to examine and interpret it before any action is taken upon it. It is in fact admitted by all that it is often ambiguous; it is clearly open to two or three interpretations, and certainly many feel it is not a very stable foundation for any reunion nor adequate basis for the constitution of a "new church" with which we are expected to be in communion.

3. That the present disorders and distresses of the Church of England really have nothing to do with the matter. It is admitted that they exist (largely because the C. of E. will not be true to itself), but that is no reason why devout members of the C. of E. should not express opinions upon a scheme, originating in a daughter Church (now an autonomous province) which is certain to affect the future of the whole Anglican Communion.

4. That those who have criticized the scheme are not theologians only, far removed from the problems of the mission field. Many of them have much missionary experience in India and elsewhere.

5. That the orderliness and fellowship of C.I.B.C., which none wish to deny, is not any proof that its Provincial Synod is bound to be right in this or any other matter which is not a matter of provincial discipline but one of faith and order. (It is worth noting that the Provincial Synod of South Africa—a province as orderly and "friendly" as the province of India—has passed resolutions against the Scheme.)

6. That there was in fact a minority in the House of Bishops of the General Council of C.I.B.C. against the scheme. The bishops are the ultimate guardians of the Faith, and in a matter of this sort we have a right to look for unanimity.

7. That Article XXI reminds us that General Councils of the Church have erred in things pertaining unto God. *A fortiori* a Provincial Synod and even a Lambeth Conference may do the same.

8. That the opponents as well as the advocates of the Scheme fervently desire reunion and are not merely "being difficult or insular."

9. That matters of principle and therefore of conscience are involved, which makes it most important to be careful how the words charity and charitable are used. For charity which has escaped the discipline of truth is no longer charitable.

10. That while the matter is *sub judice* people have every right to examine it and press for its acceptance or rejection. Indeed, this is probably one of the main ways at which we shall arrive at the truth.

11. That expediency (*e.g.*, pastoral urgency, fear of what may happen in the future) must not stampede us from principle.

12. That there are other schemes of reunion which to many seem more hopeful as not calculated to hinder the unity of the whole of Christendom—a thing which in the opinion of many the South India Scheme is calculated to do.

13. That the Scheme does not *in fact* unite the four million Christians in South India and that the best method of meeting possible persecution from a future Government is the establishment of a representative Christian Council.

14. That men must in the last resort obey their consciences, and it is quite impossible to assess the value or importance of 100 religious and 3,000 priests as against half a million Indian Christians. God alone can judge that.

Yours sincerely,
RAYMOND RAYNES, C.R.

HOUSE OF THE RESURRECTION,
MIRFIELD, YORKS.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

As one who has attended nearly every meeting of the Joint Committee on Church Union in South India from the second to the last, and as the oldest surviving member of those appointed under the Episcopal Synod, may I be permitted to add my testimony to that of Canon Peacey? As he has written, we do not complain of well-considered criticism, but of attacks from those who seem not to have studied or to have rightly represented the Scheme. It has been denounced by a member of a religious community as "a sinister conspiracy." Mr T. S. Eliot in his pamphlet *Reunion by Destruction* writes: "The Church of S. India is a *prefabricated* church." The Draft Constitution "reads like the prospectus for a company flotation." Perhaps Christians in England do not realize how close are the spiritual ties which in India bind together those who worship the Lord in truth and serve Him in their common witness to a non-Christian world. Those of us who have met time after time during these twenty-five years in the Joint Committee have been very really conscious of this spiritual fellowship and of the leading of the Holy Spirit. We have met many times almost in despair of being able to continue the negotiations, but each time after prayer and counsel the forward path has been shown. Certainly such a belief in God's guidance is not an assertion of infallibility or a denial of our own limitations. But we do ask for a recognition of the many years of prayerful preparation which have gone to the drawing up of the Scheme. Dr Thornton, in his pamphlet *The Judgement of Scripture*, speaks of tying the hands of our Lord as they were tied in the Garden of Gethsemane. Is there not a danger of tying the hands of the Lord by tradition, constitutions,

and even Old Testament exegesis? Would it be temerarious to suggest to Dr Playne that constitutions are made for the Church and not the Church for constitutions? The Church of India certainly would not persevere with the Scheme unless it was convinced that the Church of South India would still possess all the marks of catholicity, including that which has rightly been called the supreme mark—its acceptance of and continuity with the testimony of the Apostles.

I am, Sir,
Yours, etc.,
P. B. Emmet.

At 78, George Street,
Summertown,
Oxford.

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

Recent letters in the correspondence that has flowed from Canon Peacey's letter in the May number strengthen what has been in the minds of many priests who have had the privilege of overseas service—*i.e.*, that, without arrogance or presumption it is hoped, we have some contribution, based on that experience, to make to the life of the Church at home.

At present this contribution is dispersed and diffused, and it may best be so. But if the possibility of concerted and co-ordinated action appeals to any I should be glad to hear from them. Should there be value in the suggestion, and ready response, the way will be shown.

Yours, etc.,
P. N. F. Young.

The College of the Ascension,
Selly Oak,
Birmingham.

"LAODICEA IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY"

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

The readers of Theology with whom we are severally acquainted all seem to be of the opinion that the Bishop of Sheffield should not be allowed to get away with his outrageous review of Frank Bennett's *Laodicea in the Twentieth Century* in your August issue. Two-thirds of the Bishop's limited space is taken up by a categorical denial, without evidence, of Mr Bennett's diagnosis of our present diseases. The Bishop baldly asserts the, to us, pathetic belief that the faith of the Englishman is not dead but dormant. That may or may not be so. May we be permitted to venture the opinion that had the Bishop moved intimately among the personnel of those heroic armies whose undoubted valour he takes as an earnest of their latent desire to seek the Kingdom of God, he would not be so sanguine in his approach to this question. But it is quite intolerable that the Bishop should by-pass the main thesis of Mr Bennett's book, which was, if we interpret him rightly, that the Englishman is so far gone from anything approaching a belief in Christ as to have substituted for it a form of pagan nationalism which invokes Christ as a name while denying the substance

of His gospel. The right reaction of the Church to this situation should be, not the pious sanguine kindness of the optimists, but the forthright demand of Elijah to the king of Samaria: "Is it not because there is not a God in Israel, that ye go to enquire of Baalzebub the god of Ekron?" (2 Kings i, 3).

To THEOLOGY belongs the honour of having first published Mr Bennett's papers. May it not therefore be recorded in THEOLOGY that there are many of the younger and more progressive clergy who regard *Laodicea* as an heroic and penetrating diagnosis of our troubles and a call to arms which will sound very far indeed—and, of course, that they regard the Bishop of Sheffield and those who think with him on this issue as dangerous reactionaries and false prophets who cry "Peace, peace," when there is no peace?

We are, Sir,
Yours sincerely,
BERNARD PAWLEY,
Rector of Elland, Yorks.
GEORGE SNOWDON,
Vicar of St Paul's, Morley.

August 4, 1946.

The Bishop of Sheffield writes: "My review was deliberately provocative, so I cannot complain if it has had that effect. It would require more than a footnote to try to draw out the distinction between a dogmatism based on fear, which as far as I can see does not convey a gospel to the thoughtful or to the activists who would like their faith strengthened, and a dogma which speaks with a persuasive love and with an understanding of those who don't understand the theologians. The more strident of the young theologians do not seem to have got that dogma or the gospel that carries with it, and the less response they get the more liable are they to get landed in a sort of pharisaism. Not every voice crying in the wilderness is an Elijah, still less an Isaiah! If the bridges are to be kept up which can carry a gospel to other groups, then they will have to get a truer and longer perspective and, incidental to that, appreciate the substantial, as much as they now disapprove the insubstantial, in liberalism, etc."

BOOK REVIEWS

THE MIND AND HEART OF LOVE. By M. C. D'Arcy, S.J. Faber and Faber. 15s.

This is a new study of *Agape* and *Eros*. The thesis it propounds is of a double movement visible throughout the whole of creation and making its appearance at the human level in the form of two loves. Everywhere there is to be seen an interaction between "give" and "take," positive and negative, determiner and determinable, masculine

and feminine, centripetal and centrifugal. In man we find this same tension, between the love which prompts to self-perfection, represented by the *animus*, so essentially rational, regulative, possessive, and the *anima*, which lives to spend and be spent, be it often in wilful, irrational, and suicidal loves. The one is concerned with essence, with filling in what Heim would call "contents," seeking through the web of the mind to turn everything to the sustaining of its own essential nature. The other is grounded in man as existing, as a being who finds himself in encounter with other existents, dependent on them for his tenuous hold on life. It is a movement out from the self and its own content in surrender to the Thou.

These two loves correspond to *Agape* and *Eros*, and successful human living consists in holding them together in creative tension. Either to the exclusion of the other depersonalizes man. Yet at the natural level the proper harmony is unattainable, through the dislocation wrought by sin. Only in vibrating response to the chord of Divine *Agape* in Christ is the perfection of human love possible. The movement of faith is primarily one of the *anima*: man must surrender the castle of the "I" and hand over the keys—yet only to find under this new ownership the most perfect fulfilment of his essential selfhood.

There is much here that is finely said, largely illustrated, and skilfully argued. Fr D'Arcy has quarried widely and fetched stones from distant and unexpected pits to adorn his shrine of love. A real gem, for instance, is the exquisitely tender hymn to self-effacing *Agape* quoted, on page 130,—from Nietzsche!

Yet, though he succeeds in establishing his two movements of love, their identification with *Agape* and *Eros*, and therefore his claim to throw light on this much debated subject, is far more disputable. He is himself obviously embarrassed by the fact that D. de Rougement and Nygren, from whom he starts, differ radically in their analysis of *Eros*. For the latter it is essentially something self-regarding, reasonable, possessive. But for the former its type is the dark, self-immolating, dionysiac passion of Provençal romanticism. This last would seem much nearer his own definition, not of *Eros*, but of *Agape*, and he does in fact frequently point to it as the form self-giving love assumes outside the dispensation of Christianity. Yet he continues to refer to it as "this form of Eros" (p. 314) and elsewhere (*e.g.*, pp. 199 *f.*) seeks to show that Nygren and de Rougement are really not so very far apart.

The fact is that, having found his two movements of love, he proceeds to attach to them the labels *Agape* and *Eros* with little regard for anyone else's usage. He admits de Rougement's account as a valuable, if partial, analysis of *Eros*, and then silently uses it as evidence for his own view of *Agape*. He is equally careless of the classical description of *Agape*. St Paul would have learnt with surprise that his "more excellent way" was a commendation of the feminine principle in life. Indeed, the apostles opposes *Agape* as strictly to the self-immolation which gives its body to be burned as to the knowledge which puffeth up.

Does this perhaps yield a clue to where the truth must be sought? The tension between self-fulfilment and self-sacrifice is indeed with us, but is it not to be found *within both Agape and Eros*? Nygren and de

Rougement respectively reveal the two poles in the case of *Eros*. Equally, some place for finding of self in the losing requires to be made in Nygren's *Agape* if it is to be fully Christian. Wherein, then, lies the difference between *Eros* and *Agape*? May we not take a hint from D'Arcy and say that *Eros* represents this double love when directed, not towards other existents, but towards essences? *Eros* is the longing after the false infinite of the "It"-world, seeking at one and the same time to expand through gnosis and to extinguish itself by absorption in what it loves, always going out yet never "meeting" or coming to the knowledge of the Truth. *Agape*, on the other hand, is this same double movement when it is directed towards a real "other," a Thou. Instead of the tragic sadness of never-to-be-sated courtly love, there is the quiet fulfilment of Christian marriage; while the boundless self-immolation of *Eros* gives way to the neighbour-love of the Good Samaritan and the creative sacrifice of the Cross.

John A. T. Robinson.

Bristol.

Bishop Reginald Pecock: A Study in Ecclesiastical History and Thought. By V. H. H. Green. Cambridge University Press. 12s. 6d.

Mr V. H. H. Green has written a book of great interest for the study of fifteenth-century English thought, the history of the English language, and the history of Lollardy. His work takes the form of a biographical study of Reginald Pecock, who was a Welsh scholar elected to a fellowship of Oriel College in 1414/15, and afterwards promoted to the rectorship of St Michael Royal in London in 1431. He was made bishop of the poor Welsh see of St Asaph in 1444, translated to Chichester in 1450, tried for heresy in 1457, and died after honourable imprisonment in Thorney Abbey in 1460/1.

Pecock was one of those scholars who used the medieval instruments of thought but in some respects must be reckoned men of the Renaissance. The interesting thing about his career is, not that he should have been what he was, in scholarship and in life, but that he should have got into trouble about it. It is difficult to accept that his Lancastrian sympathies brought about his trial for heresy, at a time when all the English bishops had similarly received Lancastrian promotion.

There were other and more notable scholars in the first half of the fifteenth century whose thought was more revolutionary than Pecock's; but these were never in danger of being burnt, and, at one point of Pecock's career, he felt the anticipatory breath of the flame upon his face. Pecock's career was contemporary with those of the great divines of the Conciliar Movement; he left his Oxford fellowship in 1425, and was working, writing, and disputing, mainly in London, from 1431, the year that the Council of Basle opened. Compared with Pecock's dealings with the Lollards, the doctrines of the fathers of Constance and Basle seem more far-reaching and even revolutionary. At Constance, Pierre d'Ailly sought to apply to the rule of the Church that constitutionalism which political thought had so far applied only

to the State; Gerson claimed that, though the Church was eternally wedded to Christ her bridegroom, she might yet give a bill of divorcement to His Vicar: both pregnant and possibly dangerous doctrines, but no one tried to burn their exponents. At the Council of Basle Nicholas of Cusa took the place of d'Ailly and Gerson as the upholder of the Conciliar program; he was strictly Pecock's contemporary, and, like him, anticipated or was part of the early Renaissance. He doubted the Donation of Constantine and the pseudo-Isidorian decretals: he wrote against Islam as Pecock wrote against Lollards; his *De Concordantia Catholica* placed the authority of councils above that of the Popes. But nobody tried to burn him.

For this there were, perhaps, two reasons, or even three. He was a greater doctor, in the academic sense, than Pecock, who made no great name for himself at Oxford; and the Middle Ages had a proper respect for a university assessment of attainment. Then again, Nicholas, in the realm of the liberal arts, found absolute truth in the concepts of mathematics, not in the line and point drawn, but in the line and point conceived, and the mental edifice built upon them; he was a good, a devout, geometrician, and geometry has never been a danger to the faith. Pecock, on the other hand, like Peter Abaillard before him, was devout to logic and the syllogism, believing it better, if an angel from heaven said one thing and the syllogism another, to refuse credence to the angel and cleave unto the syllogism. This was another matter.

But what lay behind Pecock's trial, beyond chance irritations at his vanity and his earlier acceptance of Lancastrian promotion, was suspicion of his attempt to instruct the masses by means of English treatises. In his desire to use the vernacular for subjects hitherto treated of only in Latin, he was right in line with the humanist scholars in Italy; but he was also in line with the Lollards. Pecock's desire to write a "schort compendiose logik" in English must have seemed a doubtful expedient to bishops who desired to let Lollardy die away unlettered and underground, even though Pecock wrote:

> But wolde God it [logic] were leerned of al the comon peple in her modiris langage . . . thanne schulden they not be so obstinat agens clerkis and agens her prelatis, as summe of hem now ben, for defaut of perceuying whanne an argument procedith into his conclusioun needis and whanne he not so dooth but semeth oonli so do.

Moreover, Pecock's *Repressor of over much blaming of the clergy*, and his arguments with the Lollards, however well intentioned, were rekindling in the mid-fifteenth century a flame that was dying down, reviving academic interest in a movement that was losing its hold on the towns, and retiring to the country districts of the Chilterns, Somerset, Lincolnshire, and Buckinghamshire. Some alarm underlay the charges of heresy and error which Pecock was required to recant as having been taught by him (a heretic was never allowed to renounce his heresies in his own words): the errors to be recanted included the teaching that it was not necessary to salvation to believe in the Holy Spirit, the Holy Catholic Church, two other articles of the Apostles'

Creed, and "to believe and hold that those things which a general council of the universal Church determines . . . must be held and approved by the whole of those faithful to Christ." It seemed hard that a man who had so vigorously argued with the Lollards should be himself accused of heresy; but Pecock at his trial was in a strait where logic would not help him, and he was as unwilling to challenge the judgment of the Church, given against him, as to face the flames. "It is better to incur the taunts of the people than to forsake the law of faith and to depart after death into hellfire." He recanted, and watched the burning of his books at St Paul's Cross.

Pecock's remarkable effort to write theology in English, when it contained almost no abstract nouns and few means of conveying ideas, can be only briefly noted; the reviewer would not agree with Mr Green in describing Pecock's English prose as "crystal clear," but it is remarkable that the effort was made.

Margaret Deanesly.

Royal Holloway College,
Englefield Green.

Mysticism: Old and New. By A. W. Hopkinson. Nisbet. 7s. 6d.

This is a timely and valuable book. Mr Hopkinson sets himself one primary task—to refute the idea that mysticism and institutional religion are mutually incompatible. Instead, he shows that the former needs the other at every stage. The religion of experience and the religion of authority are not incompatible, for, he says, "Every man is a potential mystic." He puts Baron von Hügel as the "surest modern guide" about "that approach to reality and to God" which constitutes the mystic's quest. Wisely citing C. M. Yonge, he points out that the good family, like the Church, is expressive of institutionalism. Bishop Chandler's definition of mysticism as "first-hand religion" is accepted, but the author is surely over-impressed with Aldous Huxley's excursions into this field. He regards mysticism as not so much a mode of life as a code of values and mysticism on its subjective side is "a form of religious genius." Part II of this most helpful book contains some excellent and penetrating summaries of such great authorities as Walter Hilton, Richard Rolle, Juliana of Norwich, Thomas à Kempis, Vaughan, Traherne, William Law, and the author rightly divines that poetry and mysticism go hand in hand. But he overlooks Bremond's great essay on *Poésie et Prière*. He regards the English school of mystics in the fourteenth century as unsurpassed even by the Spanish school of the sixteenth century. There are wise words on asceticism, wise words on detachment, and a kind but searching commentary on Buchmanism. "Even confession may degenerate into a kind of boasting." Part III is described by the author as "pivotal" to his thesis that mysticism requires the institutional and he thinks that Christian worshippers are turning the corner from conventionality to experiment, Percy Dearmer and Gabriel Hebert being regarded as furnishing the necessary strategy and tactics for the revival of institu-

tionalism. The restoration of the Feast of the Transfiguration into the 1928 Prayer Book is described as "a trifle of a payment of the Church's debt to mystical religion." Two meditations (wrongly referred to as chapters 9 and 10) close a most suggestive and helpful essay. The grateful readers will wish to know who is "The Abbess" to whom the book is dedicated "in love and gratitude," and they will further wish that the book had both an index and a more extensive bibliography. That provided is indeed most useful, but in a future edition we should hope to see some reference to Père Grou, the Abbé Huvelin, Charles de Foucauld, Elizabeth Leseur, F. W. Faber, R. M. Benson, Charles Gore, and that too little known masterpiece by Natalie Victor, *Surrender*. Chapter IV is well worth enlarging, and the brief references to Francis Thompson and Coventry Patmore might be rearranged with profit. Strange omission is the poetry of Alice Meynell and Gerard Manley Hopkins. The pages on holy silence need expanding, and the noteworthy correlation of Traherne and Wordsworth (p. 82) opens up a fascinating psychological inquiry. The book should run through many editions.

ALBERT A. COCK.

TREGARON.

TOWARDS AN INDIAN CHURCH. By Cecil John Grimes. S.P.C.K. 15s.

All who care either for the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon or for the development of constitutional episcopacy in the Anglican Church will thank the Archdeacon of Northampton for this book. There are six chapters. The first gives the setting, and in particular the religious setting to the arrival of the East India Company in 1608. The next four describe the Church's growth from pastoral neglect under the Company to tutelage to England, and so in due course to "ordered freedom." The last describes in detail that Church's Constitution and Canons and the Indian Church Measure and Act which set it free.

The growth falls into two stages: (1) 1600-1814, when, largely by the exertions of Wilberforce and the missionary societies, the Company's new charter insisted on the appointment of a Bishop of Calcutta with three Archdeacons, and on the right of entry for missionaries; (2) 1814-1927, when the Indian Church Act was passed. This second stage can itself be divided into three periods. The first, 1814-77, was conspicuous for the heroic labours of the early bishops. To Bishop Middleton, first of the line, Dr Grimes pays a well-deserved tribute, such as has not yet been accorded to him in the Kalendar of the C.I.B.C., for his vision and wisdom in laying the foundations. After eight years, with no provision made for leave, he died worn out by his labours. The next three bishops lived an average of three years each. There followed Bishop Wilson at the age of 53 (!), who ruled his see for twenty-five years, travelled the length and breadth of India, one typical journey of 800 miles taking 100 days, built churches wherever he went, took a leading part in founding a steamer service from England, and when he died left four dioceses instead of one,

having shed Australia from his charge in the process. Two more dioceses, Lahore and Rangoon, were added as a memorial to Bishop Milman, "to secure that we don't kill any more Bishops of Calcutta." To-day there are fifteen dioceses. The second period, 1877-1912, saw regular meetings of the Bishops and the setting up of Diocesan Conferences with steady effort towards a voluntary Church order, since the lawyers said that legal change was impossible. To Bishop Copleston (1875-1913), perhaps more than to any other, the Church of India owed its advance to self-government at this stage. The last stage, 1912-27, saw a rapid change in the whole situation. The Enabling Act in England in 1919 made possible legislation whereby the Church of England herself set her daughter upon the road to independence by unanimously passing the Indian Church Measure, preparatory to the passing both of this Measure and the Indian Church Act by Parliament. To Bishop Westcott, who has just retired, deeply beloved, after a forty years' episcopate, and to Bishop Palmer the book is dedicated in gratitude for the part they played, with Bishops Waller and Western, in this final stage.

The appendices include the letters patent of Bishop Middleton, the Prefatory Statement concerning its inheritance and ideals, and the General Declarations of the Church's Constitution as approved in 1928, and, amongst others, an interesting note upon the permission given in 1833 for consecration by only two bishops, if need be, just as the Pope authorized St Augustine to do in England "without other Bishops," since there were none.

"This book," writes the Archbishop of Canterbury in the Preface, "will be a work of reference of permanent value to Church historians." It is to be hoped that it will prove as strong an encouragement to those who wish to set their house in order in the Church of England as it is undoubtedly a fascinating and scholarly story, to which the Lambeth D.D. is a fitting tribute.

The Prefatory Statement and the Declarations, thus made available to the English public, will repay study by every Churchman. They are an expression of Catholic faith and order of which the C.I.B.C. may indeed be proud.

J. R. Peacey.

Bristol.

SHORTER NOTICES

The Science of Relationships. C.M. House. 2s.

This is a report of a conference held this year to "show missionaries the necessity for concentrating upon the whole man in the whole community—the truth of redemption covering the whole of life and not isolating man's soul from his surroundings." Excellent papers achieve this admirable purpose. Those who hold the candle of "Christendom" aloft will be heartened by this companion gleam: brother clasp the hand of brother! If by any chance the report can be made known in

those parishes where the corporate active life of the congregation centres around the missionary bazaar, what anointing of eyes with eye-salve for the kindly but myopic stitchers!

M.P.R.-B.

Natural Law in the Bible. By C. H. Dodd. S.P.C.K. 6d.

This is a reprint of the two articles by Prof. Dodd which appeared in THEOLOGY in May and June, 1946.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

DESCLÉE, DE BROUWER: Gaymans d'Eypernon, S.J., *Le Mystère Primordial* (n.p.).
DOBSON: Bernard Iddings Bell, *The Altar and the World* (5s.).
DUCKWORTH: Atkinson Lee, *Groundwork of the Philosophy of Religion* (6s.).
FACULTAD TEOLOGICA DE LA COMPAÑIA DE JESUS (GRANADA): *Archivo teologico Grandanio* (Vo. VI, 1943) (n.p.).
FALCON PRESS: Peter Baker, *Confession of Faith* (7s. 6d.)
FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION: Stephen Hobhouse, *A Christian's Outline of Belief* (6d.).
FRIENDSHIP PRESS (NEW YORK): *Report of the Christian Deputation to Japan, Oct.-Nov., 1945* (25 cents).
HODDER AND STOUGHTON: C. H. Dodd, *The Johannine Epistles* (10s. 6d.).
INTER-VARSITY FELLOWSHIP: Daniel Lamont, *God's Word and Man's Response* (6d.).
W. KNOTT AND SON: G. A. C. Whatton, *The Priest's Companion* (10s. 6d.).
LITO-TIPOGRAFICA MILANO: Cesare Montanari, *Christiania in Ecce Homo* (L. 70).
MOWBRAY: Walter Carey, *The Church of England Vindicated* (6d.).
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: H. Wheeler Robinson, *Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament* (15s.).
RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PRESS: Ernest Hayes, *Grip of Ice, Drum-skin Trophy, Ploughboy's Champion, The Cheese-factor's Vow* (4d. each); John Down, *This is Our Faith* (10s. 6d.).
S.C.M. PRESS: Laurens Sargent, *Letters in the Sand* (5s.); Alice Cameron, *In Pursuit of Justice* (8s. 6d.); Anthony Hanson, *Your Reasonable Service* (7s. 6d.); Carol Graham, *Azariah of Dornakal* (6s.); W. W. Schütz, *Pens under the Swastika* (5s.).
SHEED AND WARD: Nevile Watts, *The Vision Splendid* (7s. 6d.).
SHELDON PRESS: L. E. Hertslet, *Let's Teach Health Better* (n.p.).
S.P.C.K.: Bishop of St Alban's, *Prayer to Our Father for the World To-day* (12s. per 100); *Form of Institution to the Cure of Souls and of Induction in the Diocese of Gloucester* (8d.); Watchman, *A Jersey Country Parish during the Time of Occupation* (6d.); W. K. Lowther Clarke, *Guide to Chichester Cathedral* (1s.); Eric G. Jay, *The Existence of God* (4s. 6d.); Michael Ramsey, *The Church of England and the Eastern Orthodox Church* (4d.); Charles Smyth, *The Appeal of Rome* (6d.); W. G. Addison, *J. R. Green* (6s.).
S.P.C.K. AND NATIONAL SOCIETY: Great Christians Series, *Cranmer and the Litany, Sir Thomas More, Matthew Parker, William Laud, Christopher Wren, Bishop Ken, Thomas Wilson, Robert Raikes* (1½d. each); H. C. F. Copsey, *Green for Growth* (3s. 6d.); N. O. Porter, *Parents' Associations* (6d.); *Discussion Groups* (9d.); M. Francis, *The Family Club* (2s.); A. Leigh, *The Teaching of Jesus, Jesus and the Disciples* (1s. 8d. each); *The Good Shepherd and His Flock* (1s.); Brenda Russell, *Easy Models for Scripture Teaching* (1s. 8d.); *A Scheme for Teaching Church Children* (6d.); E. H. Steele, *Youth and the Village Church* (2s.).
TYNDALE PRESS: J. S. Wright, *The Authority of the Bible* (1s.); F. Davidson, *Pauline Predestination* (2s. 6d.); E. K. Simpson, *Words Worth Weighing in the Greek New Testament* (2s. 6d.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher